

CAREER CORPS

Letter of Transmittal - Page 1 - Paragraph 3.

This will require considerable give and take between Personnel and Training. It is obviously most important that the terms of reference for both of these offices be clearly defined.

Letter of Introduction - Page ii - Paragraph II.

Why is the selection limited to fifty colleges and universities?

Letter of Introduction - Page iii - Paragraph 3.

This is not clear. Perhaps it is just a matter of wording but it seems difficult for any office to monitor a program in "consultation" with another office.

Discussion - Page 1 - Paragraph 1.

Does an individual become a Career Corps Selectee when he is chosen for initial employment with CIA or after he has completed two years of Agency service?

Discussion - Page 1 - Paragraph B.

Is it essential that all Career Corps Selectees be highly qualified linguists?

Discussion - Page 3 - Paragraph 2.

This will depend largely on the agreed divisions of work between Training and Personnel but it seems questionable that handling of contacts for recruiting would require the major part of the time of the Training Staff Member.

Discussion - Page 3 - Paragraph 4.

Shouldn't this negotiation be conducted at least jointly with the field recruiting staff member who, either presently has contacts with the colleges or universities, or will be responsible in a measure for assisting in Career Corps selection?

Discussion - Page 3 - Paragraph 5.

It is proposed to pay college contacts consultant rate of \$25.00 per day for ten days per year. If these contacts are brought to Washington for orientation, is the period of orientation to be added to or subtracted from the proposed ten days?

Discussion - Page 5 - Paragraph 2.

It would seem that a representative of the Personnel Office should also be included in this process of selection.

Discussion - Page 5 - Paragraph 5.

Can not Personnel also help develop assessment procedures for members of the Armed Forces who are being separated?

Discussion - Page 6 - Paragraph 1.

Placing final selection in the hands of the Office of Training completely eliminates line office members from an important tie into this program. Would it be possible to make final selection the responsibility of an Assessment Board, which contained Agency employees from line departments, as well as Training and Personnel?

Discussion - Page 8 - Paragraph 1.

Is it always necessary to dismiss candidates who have an unsatisfactory record in basic training?

Discussion - Page 8 - Paragraph 8.

Suggest changing "invited" to "expected".

Discussion - Page 9 - Paragraph 2.

Shouldn't the Assistant Directors have some say in the dismissal of personnel?

Discussion - Page 10 - Paragraph 2.

Does "studied annually by Personnel to identify" mean that Personnel will select Career Corps Candidates from present Agency personnel? Perhaps the responsibility for final selection should be tied down more definitely.

Discussion - Page 10 - Paragraph 4.

Is there general agreement that this assumption is correct?

Discussion - Page 12 - Paragraph 1.

Why do employees who are obviously well qualified specialists not have to appear before a Board of examination for review?

Tab "B" - III.

Is it possible to get better geographic representation of Liberal Arts colleges?

Tab "B" - IV.

Is it possible to get better geographic distribution of women's colleges?

Is it possible to reduce the 12 weeks required for basic training,

